<u> </u>	•			
` .	Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/679,705	BECKWITH ET AL.		
Examino, initiated interview Carimary	Examiner	Art Unit		
<u>'. </u>	David Guzo	1636		
All Participants:	Status of Application	n:		
(1) <u>David Guzo</u> .	(3)			
(2) <u>Isabelle Klaus</u> .	(4)			
Date of Interview: <u>8 July 2003</u>	Time: <u>3:30</u>			
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)			
Part I.				
Rejection(s) discussed: 35 USC 112, 1 st paragraph (description) rejections				
Claims discussed: All, particularly claims 43, 55-56 Prior art documents discussed: None				
Part II.				
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHA	Γ WAS DISCUSSED:		
Part III.				
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summand 	he examiner will provide a record of the substance	a written summary of t of the interview, since	the substance	
	•			
·				
<u> </u>				
David Mun -				
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicar	nt/Applicant's Representa	tive Signature – if app	ropriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner informed applicants he would be taking over prosecution of the application. Potential amendments to claims 43, 55-56 which would put these claims in condition for allowance (pending a final updated search) were discussed. Additional amendments to provide a broader scope to claim 43 were also discussed.